

Remarks

Claims 1-3, 28, and 37-38 were rejected as anticipated by RYDVAL 5,892,300. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

The Official Action contends that RYDVAL discloses a control device 11, used as a "controller configured to selectively tune or detune the pickup in response to the load sensed by the sensor" recited in claim 1 and similarly in claims 28 and 37. Applicants respectfully disagree. RYDVAL teaches tuning of the secondary circuit to match the frequency of the primary circuit (column 1, lines 28 to 39), but does not disclose a sensor configured to sense a power requirement of the load. Rather, control device 11 is used to switch in and out additional capacitors as a way to change the tuning of a resonant circuit to match that of the primary circuit (column 3, lines 33 to 38). The parameter which is detected is the output voltage of the resonant circuit (column 3, lines 64 to 65). Thus a power requirement of a load that the circuit supplies is not sensed.

Accordingly, these claims avoid the rejection under §102 because the reference does not disclose all of the claim limitations. The dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 1-3, 5-12, 16-23, 27-38, and 40-51 were rejected as unpatentable over BOYS I 5,898,579 in view of BOYS III 5,293,308 and claims 13-15 and 24-26 were rejected as unpatentable further

in view of the admitted prior art (APA) Claims 24 and 26 were rejected as unpatentable over RYDVAL in view of the APA. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of the BOYS references does not disclose all limitations recited in these claims. The teaching of the BOYS references is to maintain the frequency of the secondary resonant circuit the same as the frequency of the primary circuit in order for optimal power transfer. The references teach away from having the primary and secondary operate at different resonant frequencies (see, for example, BOYS I, column 2 line 64 to column 3 line 6). A separate and very different control strategy is then used to control the power delivered to a load. Therefore the teaching is simply to provide capacitance which allows the resonant pickup circuit to operate at the same frequency as the primary circuit. Accordingly, Applicants submit that it is not obvious to vary capacitance to tune the pickup "in response to the sensed load power requirement" as recited in claim 1 because the circuits of Figures 5 to 6 of BOYS I do not sense a power requirement of the load or control a controlled reactive element of the resonant circuit to address the sensed load power requirement - instead they sense the resonance of the primary circuit. Accordingly, these claims avoid the rejections under §103. The dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing remarks and the present amendment, it is believed that the present application has been placed in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/Thomas W. Perkins/
Thomas W. Perkins, Reg. No. 33,027
Customer No. 00466
209 Madison Street, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

TWP/lrs